

Jan. 1836

# THE BAPTIST.

"This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations."

Published Monthly.

R. B. C. HOWELL, Editor.

One Dollar a Year, paid in advance.

VOL. 2.

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.---JANUARY, 1836.

NO. 1.

## EDITORIAL.

### SECOND VOLUME.

We now lay before our readers the first number of the second volume of *The Baptist*. The paper will be conducted on the same principles as heretofore, and will have the same objects in view. What these are, we fully explained in our inaugural address of last year, which need not now be repeated. We may however, be allowed to say, that at the present crisis, the *union and harmony* of the church; is the most desired of all objects, and as every principle upon which this result may be based, but that of eternal truth, is deceitful and dangerous: we know that truth, in both doctrine and practice, must be embraced by the whole church, without which all apparent concord will be but the deceitful calm before the whirlwind. To instruct the people of God and fix in the church sound Bible principles, therefore, will for the year on which we now enter, engage our chief solicitude and most ardent efforts.

Division after division has heretofore taken place, in quick succession, among the Baptists in Tennessee. The names and number of these schisms are familiar to our readers. Had the church been established in the truth, these could never have occurred; and only the truth can save us from interminable dissensions. Without it we shall still be blown about at the mercy of every wind of doctrine. It is well known to many of our readers that efforts are now making and have been several months in progress, by some of our most influential anti-effort brethren, in different quarters, again to divide the church; and it is believed the next autumn associations, will be made the theatre of matured exertion for this end. Will our churches submit to this, and thus surrender themselves tamely into the hands of ambitious demagogues to be driven and tossed forever to please their fancy and serve the ends of party? We intend to raise still higher our warn-

ing voice against the division of the church, and invoke the paralyzing blow upon that arm, whosoever it may be, sacrilegiously stretched out to tear asunder the body of Christ. But our great instrument, we repeat it, to preserve the union is *truth*. A church without this, is like a wall daubed with untempered mortar; the first wind that blows will lay it prostrate on the earth. This will cement and unite the church in Tennessee. We request all our ministers, who love the cause of Christ, to stand by us; abjure controversy, and pour unto Zion the truth, with an unsparing hand. This the blessing of God will undoubtedly accompany, and then the church, like a tree planted by the rivers of water, shall grow up and flourish, and no demon of discord shall approach to sever its branches.

Something has been said in our paper, and in the conversation of religious circles, about issuing *The Baptist* hereafter weekly, instead of as now monthly. Could such a change be sustained, we should think it ought to be by all means made. No other Baptist paper now exists in the State. We number, according to the reports of individuals who profess to know, thirty thousand Baptists, and their best interests we believe, requires them to sustain a weekly paper, which they are fully able to do. Two or three months ago we expressed our views on this subject, and requested our brethren and friends to advise us of their wishes in relation to it. But about half a dozen only have since responded to our call. They, it is true, all expressed themselves in favour of the change, but as those who have remained silent may possibly be averse, we conclude that the change cannot now be made. We shall therefore, go on with the paper as heretofore. We have made arrangements for its publication, monthly, during the present year, at the office of the *National Banner*, and by charging nothing for our editorial labours, can, even with our present number of subscribers, con-

tinue to issue the work at the astonishingly low price for which it is afforded to subscribers. We are anxious and we again request our friends to make some more efforts, to have our list of subscribers enlarged; not alone for the benefit of the paper, but that we may be able, through this medium, to speak to every Baptist in the whole country, and that each one who has any thing to say for the general good may do the same. Thus we shall all, however widely separated, be like one congregation; we can all in some sense be acquainted with each other, and can act in concert for the glory of God, the improvement of each other and the salvation of sinners. Thus too we can promote union, and avoid the curse of a house divided against itself.

We take this occasion to express our thanks to our correspondents and attentive agents, both in and out of Tennessee, for their numerous favours received, and to request a continuance of their kindness. Well written essays, of an orthodox character, on all theological subjects, will always find a ready admittance into the columns of the *Baptist*. Will not our literary brethren, ministers &c., supply us with a larger number of these? A continuance of communications on the state of religion, the progress of the cause, revival intelligence, and accounts of the doings of Associations, with a copy of their minutes, &c. &c., are also requested. We shall however, studiously exclude from our columns, every communication wanting in the spirit of kindness inculcated in the scriptures, which indulges in personal reflections, or is in any other manner calculated to extinguish the flame of brotherly love, or retard the union, and harmony of the church. Our experience during the year past, as an Editor, has afforded us information in its various departments, by which we hope to gain some advantage ourselves, and which we shall be able, we trust, to turn to the benefit of our readers. If *The Baptist* has been for the year past, conducted with any efficiency, its friends have in this circ-

stance, a guaranty for the energy of its future character and usefulness; and we ask from an intelligent community, only that measure of favour which the candid and unprejudiced may award as due to our labours.

In conclusion we ask the prayers of all christians, for the blessing of God to accompany our efforts, both as an Editor, and as a minister of Jesus Christ, for whose sake we are the servant of the church. For "without his blessing we can do nothing;" but Jesus Christ strengthening us, we can do whatever our duty and the cause of God shall require.

#### TO ELDER BURNS.

Our venerable father Burns, in a letter published in the last Baptist, asks whether, in the Indian Nation, as he cannot obtain the services of Ministers to form a presbytery for the constitution of churches, he may not dispense with them, and form presbyteries of old experienced Deacons. In reply we remark, that whatever course might be thought admissible in such an exigency, we doubt whether, in the present state of affairs, it would be prudent to do so, for many reasons not necessary to be named and some of which will readily suggest themselves to him. Ministers can ultimately be obtained, and as he is a missionary, he will remember that "caution is the parent of safety."

#### BAPTIST TRIENNIAL REGISTER, FOR 1836.

To complete this work now in a course of preparation, it is necessary that the minutes of all our Associations for 1835 shall be had. The author has received of all the Associations in Tennessee, only the minutes of the Cumberland. Again we ask, that some one in each Association in the State, shall send forthwith, a copy of the minutes for 1835 directed—*I. M. Allen, Philadelphia, Pa. periodical.* We say forthwith, because the work is to be published in March next, and any delay will render the minutes useless.

#### UNIVERSITY OF NASHVILLE.

Our University has commenced its winter session with flattering prospects. About a hundred students are in attendance.

#### JACKSON COLLEGE.

Upwards of ten thousand dollars have been subscribed to remove Jackson College from its present locality to Columbia.

#### BAPTIST ADVOCATE.

The second volume of this work is forthcoming. We bespeak for it the favorable notice and patronage of Tennesseans. The

Editor of this paper, is one of the assistant Editors of the Advocate.

#### BAPTISM—NO. V.

We come now to consider the last argument used by our Pædobaptist brethren to sustain the baptism of infants. They assert that evidence is found in the writings of the Christian fathers, that infant baptism was in existence in the earliest times of the Church. They conclude therefore that it must have been practised by the Apostles, and consequently is at the present day a duty which we are required to observe.

In reply to the proposition, we have to observe, that even were they able to produce proof that infant baptism was practised in the earliest ages of the Church, it does not therefore follow that the Apostles practised it, nor is it decided by such evidence that it was agreeable to the will of God. The whole will of God is revealed in his word. We have already seen that in no part of that word does it receive the least countenance, therefore, even though it might have originated while the Apostles were yet living, which we shall presently prove was not the fact, it was not on that account the less an injurious innovation. The heresies of Cerinthus and the Gnostics, were introduced during the life of the Apostle John, and are the destructive principles held by these schismatics, therefore, the less to be deprecated! If the friends of infant baptism could prove that the practice existed at a very early period, and indulge the supposition that its legitimacy is established by this circumstance, with how much more propriety might the followers of Cerinthus, and the abettors of the dogmas of Gnosticism, plead for the truth of their pernicious and ruinous principles upon the same ground. The Scriptures support as fully the latter as they do the former.

That, on the subject of baptism, the Church did, at a very early period, depart from the principles laid down by Christ, there can be no doubt. Tertullian, who wrote in the beginning of the third century, says, (De Corona Melitis—Du Pin, vol. 1, p. 97.) "To begin with baptism. When we are ready to enter into the water, and even before, we make our protestations before the Pastor and in the Church, that we renounce the devil and all his pomps and ministers; afterwards we are plunged in the water three times, and they make us answer to some things that are not precisely set down in the Gospel; after that, they make us taste milk and honey, and we bathe ourselves every day during the week. We receive the sacrament of the Eucharist instituted by Jesus Christ, when we eat and

in the morning assemblies, and we do not receive it but from the hands of those that preside there. We offer yearly oblations for the dead, in honor of the martyrs. We believe it is not lawful to fast on Sundays and to pray to God kneeling. From Easter to Whitsuntide, we enjoy the same privilege. We take great care not to let any part of the wine and consecrated bread fall to the ground. We often sign ourselves with the sign of the cross. If you demand a law for these practices taken from the Scriptures, we cannot find one there, but we must answer, that it is tradition that has established them, custom that has authorized them, and faith that has made them to be observed." Tertullian was a great master in Israel, a venerable father of early times. A moment's reflection on what he here says, and the manner in which he speaks of these most childish and antisciptural follies, such as tasting milk and honey, bathing every day for a week, offering annual oblations in honor of the martyrs, and several others, as established by tradition, authorized not by the Bible but by custom, and in their observation rendered dear to faith, will enable us to understand how to estimate any opinions of the fathers or of the Church, however ancient, on any religious practice not found in the word of God. How much has the cause of righteousness suffered by foolish devices of men. How much of turmoil and strife would have been avoided, by a proper attention to the wise admonition of Solomon, (Prov. 30 c. 5, 6 v.) "Every word of God is pure,"—"Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee and thou be found a liar."

We learn by this, and other testimonies, that the Church, as early as the beginning of the third century, was degraded by puerile and unmeaning ceremonies, and corrupted by the introduction of rites confessedly unknown to the New Testament, but as yet infant baptism had not found its way among them. The invention of this hobby of modern times was reserved for a later age. Several fathers are quoted as evidence of the existence of infant baptism in the first ages after the Apostles. All those whose testimony is worth any thing, we propose now to examine.

We begin with Justin Martyr, who was beheaded under Marcus Aurelius, in the year one hundred and sixty-seven. This father says, (vide Dr. Woods on Baptism.) "Several persons among us, of sixty or seventy years old and of both sexes, who were disciplined to Christ in their childhood, do continue uncorrupted." Our Pædobaptist brethren contend, that this discipling means baptism, and as sixty or seventy years must have carried them back to the days in which the Apostles lived

they were baptised in infancy and in the days of the Apostles. The use made of this passage from Justin, shows how some men will overstrain and wrest the fathers, to make them speak in favor of any sentiments their prejudices may have led them to adopt. In regard to the quotation before us, we have to remark, *first*, that the word used by Justin for discipling, is *ematheteutesan*, the very same used by Christ in the commission when he directs his Apostles to go and *teach or disciple* all nations. The persons, therefore, of both sexes, "now sixty or seventy years old," were said by Justin to have been *taught*, in the manner commanded by the Lord Jesus, at an early age; but not a word is said of their baptism. To suppose that this *teaching* was *baptising* them, is unsupported, gratuitous and absurd. We observe, *secondly*, that the word used to express their age is *paidion*, (*gen. of pais*.) the same used to denote the age of the young man Eutiches, who fell down from the third loft while Paul was preaching, and whom the Apostle restored to life. They were therefore young men and ladies when they were disciplined. (Let. Dav. et John, p. 46 et seq.) We are irresistibly led to the conclusion, that by the words used, it was the intention of Justin Martyr, to exclude infancy from this description of persons disciplined. The whole of this case then goes for nothing, so far as assistance to the cause of infant baptism is concerned.

Moreover, if Justin, in the passage quoted, is made to convey an idea that the persons mentioned by him were baptised in infancy, he will be found, by comparing this with another part of his writings, to have palpably contradicted himself. In his second Apology to Antonius Pius, the Roman Emperor, this Father has the following language—"I will declare unto you how we offer up ourselves unto God, after that we are received through Christ. Those among us *instructed in the faith*, are brought to the water, then they are baptised therein in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Then we bring the person thus baptised or washed to the brethren where the assemblies are, that we may pray both for ourselves and the newly illuminated person; that we may be found by doctrine and good works, worthy observers and keepers of the commandments. The bread and wine being brought to the chief brother, he takes it, and offers praise and thanksgiving to the Father, in the name of the Son and the Holy Ghost. After prayer and thanksgiving the whole assembly says amen. When thanksgiving is ended by the chief guide and consent of the whole people, the Deacons give to every one present part

of the bread and wine, over which thanks is given. This we call the Eucharist, to which no man is admitted but he that believeth the truth of the doctrine and lives as Christ has taught." According to this declaration of Justin, you will readily perceive that the law of baptism promulgated in the Apostolic commission, was strictly observed by the early Church. Those then baptised were first instructed in the faith; this Father calls them the "*illuminated*;" and immediately after their baptism, in all cases they were placed at the Lord's table. It is distinctly added, by Justin himself, that none received the Lord's supper but those who believed the truth of the doctrine and lived as Christ taught. Nothing, therefore, can be more preposterous than the supposition that Justin Martyr bears evidence to the existence, in his time, of infant baptism.

Irenius, the Bishop of Lyons, who suffered martyrdom under Severus in two hundred and three, is sometimes brought forward to prove the early existence of infant baptism. We shall now examine his testimony. The following are his words.—"Christ came to save all persons by himself, all I mean who are regenerated unto God, infants, and little ones, and children, and youths, and elder persons." We shall be asked by what strange process baptism can be found in this passage. The word does not occur at all in any of its forms. They tell us that when Irenius says *regenerated*, he means *baptised*! Strange indeed! especially to be adduced as evidence in the case under consideration. Take it for granted, that if they had any tolerable proof, they never would bring forward such as this. Regeneration means baptism! Well, let us try it. If such were his meaning, the passage will make sense and good theology, by substituting the word *baptism* in the place of regeneration. We will repeat the passage with this substitution, "Christ came to save all persons by himself; all, I say, who are *BAPTISED*, infants, little ones, children, youths and elder persons." What! does Irenius say that no *infants*, nor *little ones*, nor others, can be *saved*, unless they be *baptised*? Yes, such is the folly Pædobaptists make him utter, in order to force him into their cause! And after all this, to convey an idea of his orthodoxy; to make us believe that he was as pure in doctrine as the Gospel itself; they tell us, he was a disciple of Pollicarpe, who was a disciple of John. Could such a man, so circumstanced, palpably contradict the word of God, and, in defiance of Scripture and reason, contend that the baptism of infants was necessary

their salvation. It cannot be believed. When he says *regeneration*, he means *regeneration and not baptism*. In the passage quoted Irenius says, Christ came to save sinners by himself, and adds that infants, &c. would be saved by him, as well as elder persons who were regenerated; but he says not a word of baptism. As a witness, therefore, to the early existence of infant baptism, Irenius, as well as Justin Martyr, entirely fails. We have now passed through two hundred years from the establishment of Christianity, and Pædobaptism is without a single prop to support it from tumbling to the earth.

Origin, of Alexandria, and Tertullian, the first Latin father, both of whom flourished in the beginning of the third century, are quoted with great confidence by Pædobaptists as affording support to their cause. On the testimony of each of these fathers, we shall offer a few observations.

In his homily on Luke, (14-cap.) Origin says, "*Little ones* are baptised for the remission of sins." Similar language was used by him in his eighth sermon on Leviticus, and in his commentary on the Romans. In regard to Origin himself, we observe, that he has been called "an everlasting allegoriser." In reading his works, you can never be assured whether you may understand what he says literally, or whether it is a figure, concealing something of a different import from anything that appears. The expression "*little ones*," is as likely to have been used to describe such persons as Paul calls "*tubes in Christ*," that is recently regenerated, as any others, and indeed much more so. When we consider Origin's character and peculiarly figurative manner, and some things flat will presently claim our attention, this will be rendered evident. However, many of his opinions were the most wild and extravagant that can well be imagined. For example: Origin held the pre-existence of human souls; and in his commentary on John, contended that "some souls, before they were born into the world, and before they were united to the body, had heard and been taught of the Father." (John, 6, 45. Gale Lett. 7.) As we have already seen, that the Church at this time worshipped the martyrs and held several other abominations, it would not have been at all astonishing if such a genius as Origin had conceived the baptism of infants. We should not, indeed, knowing his character, have been surprised if he had contended that they had been baptised in another state of existence before they came into this world.

mark, that two sorts remain. The one genuine Greek fragments; the other a pretended Latin version of his genuine Greek originals. The Greek remains of this father, contain not a syllable on infant baptism; on the contrary, as Doctor Gale observes, (Reflec. on Wall, Let. 13.) "baptism is always spoken of in relation to the adult." In the Latin translations alone is any thing found referring, even by supposition, to the baptism of infants. In the truth or correctness of this translation, not the least dependence can be placed. It was made principally by Rufinus, with perhaps some part by Jerom, and not until the beginning of the fifth century, some time after infant baptism was invented and introduced. This work is acknowledged on all sides to be so full of the garblings and interpolations of the translators, that no one can now determine what part of it was written by Origin himself, and what by Rufinus and Jerom. For the truth of these remarks, we beg leave to refer you to the writings of the learned Du Pin, (vol. 1, p. 108.) who says— "Those Latin works we have here, translated by Rufinus and others, with so much liberty that it is a difficult matter to discern what is Origin's own, from what has been foisted in by interpreters." On these accounts, every one knows, or ought to know, that no candid Pædobaptist will quote these Latin remains, which speak more the language of Rufinus and Jerom than of Origin, as any proof of the existence of the practice in question, in the third century. Hence it is matter of surprise that Dr. Woods and others should rely upon them, which, from their writings, it would seem they do with great confidence. When Sir Peter King had referred to the works of this father as proof of infant baptism, he was severely reprov'd by Doctor Wall, (Hist. Inf. Bap. part 1, ch. 5, sec. 9, Gale's Let. 13.) who proceeded to prove that the "little ones," or babes of Origin, were precisely such as those to whom Peter addressed his first Epistle. "New born babes"—"laying aside all evil speakings, and desiring the sincere milk of the word, that they may grow thereby." Even the Papists are ashamed of some of the extravagancies of Origin, and say, that "all his errors arose from his efforts to accommodate the truths of the Christian religion, to the principles of the Platonic philosophy. We need not examine Origin further. It is demonstrated that he affords not a syllable of proof that infant baptism existed in his day. On the contrary, all his genuine works that refer to the subject of Doctor Gale's assertion be correct,

ly entitled to receive the ordinance of baptism.

Let us now for a moment consider Tertullian. This father remarks, in his book against Quintilla, (cap. 18,) "Jesus Christ says, indeed, 'hinder not little children from coming to me,' but he also declares that those who should be allowed to come to baptism must first make a profession of religion, and he maintains that none should be admitted to the ordinance in question, until they fully understand its importance and solemnity. The following are his words, (Liber adver. Quin. Cap. 18,) "Let them come and learn, and when they understand Christianity, then let them profess themselves Christians" by baptism, the appointed rite.—How any Pædobaptist can extort from Tertullian any thing which seems, even to them, like testimony in favor of the existence of infant baptism in his time, is one of those inscrutable mysteries so frequently found connected with unauthorized religious ceremonies. Luther, with whom, in learning and research, none of us pretend to be equal, could find no such evidence. He says, as we have before seen, that "it cannot be proved that infant baptism was instituted by Christ, or begun by the first Christians after the Apostles." As, after those we have examined, no other writer speaks of the subject under consideration until about the fourth century, when the Church was overrun by corruptions of every sort, our inquiries as to the evidence of the Christian Fathers need be pursued no further.

The question will probably be asked us, at what time infant baptism was introduced into the Church. As the answer to this interrogation involves some interesting historical considerations, we shall call upon learned Pædobaptists, who will furnish us with a reply. The celebrated Claudius Salmasius, in agreement with the equally learned divine of Zurich, John Gaspard Suicerus, says, (vide Booth's Pæd. Ex.) "In the two first centuries no one was baptised, except, being instructed in the faith and acquainted with the doctrine of Christ, he was able to profess himself a believer." To this we will add the testimony of Carcellæus of Geneva. (*ut supra*) He asserts that the baptism of infants, in the two first centuries after Christ, was wholly unknown, but in the third and fourth was allowed by some few. He adds—"in the fifth and following ages, it was generally received." Episcopius (*ut supra*) "denies that any tradition can be produced for Pædobaptism, till a little before the Meleritan Council, Anno Domini four hundred and eigh-

teen, and maintains that the baptism of infants was not practised in Asia, till near the time of that council." To the testimony of these and other Pædobaptist writers equally learned on the point before us, we feel no disposition to object.

It is true, that Augustine, and some others who lived about this time, argue in favor of infant baptism and say in its defence, that it was an apostolical tradition. Augustine particularly remarks (Apud Let. Dav. and John) "that he does not remember to have heard of any person, whether catholic or heretic, who maintained that baptism is to be denied to infants." Augustine however, lived at too late a period, and the church was too corrupt at his day, for any such declaration to have much weight. Let us examine into some facts on the subject. Was Augustine himself baptised in infancy? Notwithstanding his parents were Christians, he was not baptised until he was thirty years of age. (Bayle's Gen. Dict. Art. Vit. Aug.) Ambrose the Bishop of Milan baptised Augustine; was Ambrose baptised in his infancy? Every one knows he did not receive baptism until after his election as Bishop. (St. Ambrose Vit.) Was Augustine's son, or his father baptised in infancy? Who does not know to the contrary. "The parents of St. Augustin, says Bishop Taylor," and St. Hierom and St. Ambrose, though they were Christians, yet did not baptise their children till they were over thirty years of age; and St. Chrysostom who was instituted and brought up in religion by the famous and beloved Bishop Miletus, was yet not baptised until he was twenty years of age; (Grotius' annot. on Mat. 19 c. 14 v.) and Gregory of Nazianzum, though he was the son of a Bishop, yet he was not christened till he came to man's age." (Dufresne desc. St. Soph. Note 72 Basil Op. tom. 3.) Does Augustine say, he never heard of any one who maintained that baptism was to be denied to infants? "He once pretended to be a Manichean; did he not know that they denied baptism to infants?" Had he forgotten himself when he taxed the Pelagians with denying infant baptism; (Gill to Diss. Gen.) and when he complained (Op. De. Paccator Lib. 2 Cap. 25) of other people who denied and would not practice the ceremony? But we will go no further. "Augustine was not always a saint," as this assertion of his fully testifies. Events which we have noticed, and which were occurring all around him, and indeed in which he mingled and was personally interested, show how much confidence is due to his declaration, that infant baptism was an apostolical tradition.

Doctor Doddridge, treating on the matter under consideration says, "It is indeed surprising that nothing more express is to be met with in antiquity, on the subject." For ourselves, we do not think it at all matter of astonishment. It is not reasonable to suppose that history will record events which never occurred, or that the early fathers can afford testimony in favour of a practice that exists only in the waking dreams of their modern successors. The writings either in whole or in part of more than FORTY fathers, who lived before Tertullian, have come down to us. Of all this number, it is not pretended that more than four or five have any reference to infant baptism; and we have shown that even these, although tortured again and again, on the wheel of Pædobaptism, yet bear not a syllable of testimony. Justin Martyr speaks of the conversion of some persons when young men and ladies. This conversion they call baptism, and carry it back to infancy against authority. In thus forcing his expressions to suit their purposes, they make him contradict himself and utter the grossest absurdities. Irenæus is subjected to precisely the same treatment with the same results. The forgeries of Rufinus of the fifth century, are attributed to Origin, and then triumphantly brought forward in proof, notwithstanding they are self-condemned and nugatory. Tertullian absolutely denies that any should be baptised, but those "who understand Christianity and profess themselves Christians." This positive blank is all that can be drawn from upwards of forty witnesses during about three hundred years from the time of our Lord Jesus Christ. We have thus demonstrated that infant baptism was not in existence until late in the third century, or the beginning of the fourth, and obtained no countenance whatever, until the church was overrun by superstitions and corruptions of every sort. We pledge ourselves for every proof which can be adduced, of the existence of infant baptism during the first three hundred years, to bring forward, from the same period, a proof equally good for worshipping the Martyrs, and other men, for praying to Saints and Angels, for transubstantiation and the whole round of popery. If you receive infant baptism upon the testimony of such fathers as bear witness to it, you are obliged upon the same testimony to receive all the mummeries of papal superstition, and if you reject these, for the same reason you must reject that.

Thus we see an end of infant baptism. "Its friends have tried circumcision, and the law of the Abrahamic covenants; they have tried

commands and precedents of the Old and New Testaments; they have tried proselyte baptism, and household baptism; they have travelled from Genesis to Revelations, from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth; they have searched the annals of the world, and have been able to find not a solitary vestige of infant baptism, either in example, precept or command." The truth is, it is only sustained by the distempered imagination of the prejudiced, and those who are content to be led along in the rusty shackles of wornout popery.

The question will doubtless be proposed by the affectionate parent, what then shall I do with my dear little children? Must they be suffered to grow up without instruction or the fear of God? Must I adopt no method by which to impress religious truth on their minds? To each of these interesting questions the word of God affords a full and satisfactory answer, but no where does that word countenance a resort to baptism for any of these purposes. We are at a loss to conceive how any one ever could suppose that the slightest moral or physical good, for the child, could by such means be procured. None are more anxious than Baptists to secure religious instruction for their children, and to impress upon their tender and susceptible minds, just views of their own character, and of the relation in which they stand to God. Nor do any indulge a more fervent affection for their tender and beloved offspring, more frequently offer them up to God in prayer, or realize more sensibly the authority of the command to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. What good, we would however inquire, do children or parents derive from their baptism? Are the children the better for it; or are the obligations of parents or friends increased? Unbaptised children are certainly saved, if they die in infancy, nor does their baptism, in the least degree facilitate their salvation. Who dare say that the baptised children of Pædobaptists are any more docile, mild or inclined to piety, than the unbaptised children of Baptist parents? Every one is obliged by a command of God to teach his children, protect them, form their hearts to virtue, and in a word, "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord;" and can any promises or ceremonies into which they may enter, add to the obligations of a command of God? The supposition is preposterous beyond a parallel. He who neither feels the influence of parental love, nor recognizes the authority of divine law, may need such obligations as the baptism of his children is presumed to

impose, otherwise the rite is as useless as it is absurd and unauthorized.

We rejoice that the boundaries which inclose the Holy Bible, circumscribe our faith and practice as christians. That we are not left to wander in the reveries of paganized christians, or christianized pagans. As Baptists, we are bound to shape all things, and by his grace we will do so, "according to the pattern shown to us in" the word of God.

#### MAILS.

Our roads, always bad in the winter, are now we think worse than usual. The Mails are irregular, and some of our subscribers complain of not receiving their paper. We ask that whenever any subscriber fails to receive his paper, he will advise us of the fact, and the numbers wanting shall again be sent.

#### JACKSONVILLE REGISTER.

Our brother Wood has removed the Western Baptist Monitor from Madisonville, in this State, to Jacksonville Ala., and changed its name to Jacksonville Register. His sheet presents its usual handsome dimensions and appearance. Brother Wood has our very best wishes for his success both editorially, and as a Minister. We regretted to lose him from Tennessee, but what we have lost, Alabama has gained. The cause is the same every where.

#### HISTORY OF THE WELCH BAPTISTS.

We had observed in the newspapers, for several months past, frequent notices of a new history of the Welch Baptists. During our recent visit to Cincinnati we purchased the book, and have since read it, as we do every thing connected with our history and especially our antiquities, with great interest. It is a small work of 204 pages, by J. Davis, printed at Pittsburgh during 1835. We design in the present article, to lay before our readers some facts collected from various parts of the volume, to show that not only in continental Europe, as Germany, France, &c. but also in Wales, has a regular Baptist church existed, keeping the ordinances as they were received from the Apostles, and an unbroken succession of faithful ministers preaching the Gospel in its primitive purity, from the apostolic age to the present time. But before we do so, we shall take occasion to express our opinion, in two or three general remarks, of the ability with which the work has been executed. We do not indeed lay claim to the character of literary reviewers, nor do we design in this instance to play the critic. As however we may be

this volume frequently hereafter, and as we propose to recommend its perusal to our readers, a word or two is due, equally to them and ourselves. It cannot be said of this work, and we regret it, that its literary character is of a high order. Its style wants that classic polish which would recommend it to the lovers of literature; and the author often indulges in discussions of principles and in a train of moralizing on his facts, which few readers will allow in a historian. The writer has not, we think, done justice to his materials, of which he seems to have had a large amount and of rare excellence. His arrangement is not judicious. He indulges in much needless repetition. He throws events intimately related to each other, by time and character, so far asunder that they fail to make their proper impression. And in his recapitulation, he introduces many new facts, and gives us nearly two copies of his work in one volume. Another great defect is found in the neglect, though not very extensively, to substantiate his facts by his authority. This however is true in relation to several of his statements of the most thrilling interest and importance; and thus are we deprived of the pleasure both of relying upon these facts, to defend our church, and of the means of examining for ourselves the sources of his information. Upon these, therefore, in our gleanings from the work, we shall place no reliance. Notwithstanding all these defects, however, we earnestly recommend the book to our readers, and assure them that they will arise from its perusal instructed and improved. Its authenticated details are such as cannot readily be obtained by the common reader, and should certainly be known to all who desire to secure an accurate knowledge of ecclesiastical history. But to our facts gleaned from the work.

The Gospel was introduced into Wales, in the year of our Lord 63, not originally, as has been contended by some, by the apostle Paul, nor, as insisted upon by others, by Joseph of Arimathea, but by natives of the country converted in Rome. Prudence, (Pudens) a Welchman, who with his wife Claudia, are both mentioned by Paul, (in 2 Tim. 4 c. 21 v.) were of the Cumri, or Welch, and members of Caesar's household. Several other Welch people of distinction were in Rome at the same time, and were also converted to the faith of the Gospel by the instrumentality of Paul, during the time he received visitors in his own hired house. These all had no sooner obtained an experimental knowledge of

their friends and countrymen, and returning to Wales began effectually to make known the Lord Jesus, as the Saviour of sinners. Their hearts were opened of God to receive it, and thus the Gospel was planted there, and by these christians and their converts, assisted by three missionaries Illyd, Kyndaff, and Arwystly, Welchmen, converted in Rome while there as prisoners of war, it was preached, and notwithstanding violent opposition from the paganism of the times, continued to gain strength until 180, upwards of a hundred years. These statements are made upon the authority of Fox's Acts and Monuments, p. 137, Dr. Gill, and Mat. Henry, com. on 2 Tim. 4 c. 21 v., Crosby's history of the English Baptists, pref. to vol. 2, and a Welch work called Drych y. prif. oesoedd p. 179.

It is contended and we think with good reason, though our author regards the authority as doubtful, by several learned writers, which we at different times have read, that between 63 and 180 Paul first, and afterward several apostolic men, visited the Welch christians, and greatly strengthened and advanced the cause. And here to avoid misunderstanding, it is necessary to remark, that at the time of which we now speak, those more recently called Welch were called Britons, and indeed the Welch, as every one knows, are the ancient Britons. They were driven into the mountains of the west, where they have since lived, by the Angles, who took possession of a large part of their country, and have from that time been called English. When therefore we speak of ancient Britian, the country and ancestors of the present Welch are meant. Our readers will keep this explanation in mind. Henin in his Cosmography lib. 1, p. 257, and Drych, y prif. oesoedd, p. 190, tell us, and their authority is vouched by the work before us, that in A. D. 180, two Welchmen, Faganus and Damicanus, ministers of great talents and piety who had resided in Italy, were sent by the churches of Italy, as missionaries to Wales to assist their countrymen. Their presence and labours gave an astonishing impetus to the cause. About this time religion began to make its way into the very highest circles and Lucius, in Welch Lies ab Coel, the Welch king, made a profession of religion and was baptized. He was the first monarch in the world who made a profession of the religion of Christ. (Acts and Mon. p. 80, Bede's Hist. Eccles. lib. 1, ch. 4—Salutaris lux a Fabricio p. 406.) Druidism, the reigning superstition of the country, now began to give way every where, the light of religion

of Anglesea to Thanet, and prayer and praise were equally the employment of the King on his throne at Carludd, and of the peasant in his cabin at the foot, and in the fastnesses of Caderedris and Plimlimon.

The Romans had long before taken possession of Britain, and their army and Emperors were often there. The Welchmen of distinction as we have already intimated, were frequently, and in considerable numbers, in Rome the imperial city of the Casars. A most remarkable circumstance growing out of this state of things took place which has since vitally affected the interests of the whole world, and affords another instance of the fact that events of comparatively minor importance sometimes imprint their characteristics upon the millions of a thousand ages. The Emperor of Rome, Constantian, married a Welch lady, her name in Britain was Elen, but she was called by the Romans Helina. She was the daughter of Coel Godebog, the Earl Gloucester, afterwards King of Britain, a lady of eminent beauty and intelligence. Constantine the great was the son of this lady, and was in fact born in Wales, and may therefore, in some sense, be said to have been a Welchman. Elen was a christian; her heart had been, in her own country, early and deeply imbued with the love of Christ. She taught her son the same religion, from his childhood, with the greatest care, and the world knows the result. Constantine was raised to the throne of the Empire. He immediately abolished all the persecuting edicts of his predecessors, and gave peace and security to the christians throughout the vast dominions of Rome. Thus did Wales repay to Rome, with infinite interest, the blessing she had received from the imperial city, by the instrumentality of a persecuted apostle, driven from country to country by the malice of the enemies of christianity. (Drych y. prif. oesoedd. p. p. 64, 303, Thomas' Hist. of the Baptists in Wales, written in Welch Williams' oeslyfr, Acts, and Mon. p. 104. Danvers on baptism p. p. 60, 61.)

It has been said, and with truth, that "when kings and emperors embrace religion, they either do too much for it or too little." This remark was verified, in part, in the case of which we speak. Soon after Constantine embraced religion, he established it as the religion of the empire, and a state of things was introduced inimical to the simplicity, and purity of the Gospel. He raised the clergy to wealth and distinguished them with place and power. The church was largely and richly endowed by imperial munificence. The pulpit and the altar became the step-

ping stone to promotion and honour, and we are not therefore surprised, that the proud, the aspiring & the hypocritical, come pouring like a flood into the house of God; and, on the continent, corruptions and abuses began to show themselves in the church. But in Wales it was not so. These ancient people were remarkably endowed with wisdom in regard to the spiritual character of the kingdom of Christ. They therefore, kept it separate from the state; and, in their own country, vigorously and successfully resisted every innovation, preserving the ancient simplicity and purity of divine worship. The Romans now forsook the Island of Britain, because no longer able to preserve their conquest; and soon but little intercourse existed between them and their ancient allies. Difficulties it is true existed, but the Welch church maintained original principles and thus affairs progressed until about A. D. 600. Eminent and Godly ministers continued during this period to preach, such as Gildas, Dyfrig, Dynawf, Teilo, Padarn, Pawlin, Daniel, &c. &c. Nor did our Welch ministers fail, in the mean time, to make attempts to restore to their original simplicity their brethren on the continent. For which purpose they, and especially Gildas who was a man eminent for his literary acquirements as indeed were many others of them, wrote in Latin, many books most or all of which are now lost.

As an evidence of the general fact of the prevalence of the Gospel, at a very early period, among the ancient Britons, (Welch) and therefore, to a very considerable extent, confirmative of the statements we have made, Mr. Davis quotes several of the early fathers, whose works have come down to us. We now notice briefly several of these quotations.

Tertullian, who wrote about the middle of the second century, says, (*Adversus Judæos*, chap. 7, pag. m. 92) the Gospel had in his time been preached and had taken effect—"In all the boundaries of the Spaniards, all the different nations of the Gauls (French), and those parts of Britain accessible to the Romans." This remark, it will be observed, was made, by this Carthaginian writer, before the mission we have noticed of Paganus and Domicanus, and proves that the Gospel was preached in Wales during the first century.

Origin, who wrote the book quoted, in 230, says (op. vol. p. 370.) "Quando, enim terra Britannia ante adventum Christi, in unum Dei consensit religionem." (When, before the coming of Christ did the land of Britain agree in the worship of one God.) In his time therefore, the Gospel must have been

great progress in Britain, otherwise it could not have been said that that nation then agreed in the worship of one God.

Eusebius says, in the third book of his *Evangelical Demonstrations*, that some of the Apostles passed over the sea, and preached the Gospel to the Britons, in their Islands. This information he had probably received from the Emperor Constantine, or from some of the Welch Pastors in the council of Nice.

The most important inquiry is yet to be decided in relation to this subject. How do we know that these early christians were Baptists? We reply that our information on this subject is ample, derived from Mosheim, Benedict, and other historians, and of a character not to be mistaken. Mosheim says, in relation to the baptism of the christians in two or three of the first centuries (vide *Hist. Eccles.*, 1, and 2, cents.) "Baptism was administered &c.—without the public assemblies, in places appointed for that purpose, and was performed by immersion of the whole body in water." In relation to the ecclesiastical polity of those times, the same historian, who it is well known was far from being a baptist; indeed he was one of the most inveterate enemies the baptists ever had, speaks as follows—(*ut supra*) "The churches, in these early times, were entirely independant; none of them was subject to any foreign jurisdiction, but each of them was governed by its own rulers and laws. For though the churches founded by the Apostles, had this particular deference shown them, that they were consulted in doubtful, and difficult cases, yet they had no juridical authority, no sort of supremacy over the others, nor the least right to enact laws for them; nothing on the contrary, is more evident than the perfect equality that reigned among the primitive churches." It is true, that in those early times the church was not called Baptist, because as the whole church observed the ordinances as delivered there was no need for this, or any other distinctive appellation, nor were any such adopted until degeneracy had taken possession, and large numbers had departed from the simplicity of the Gospel. But what church now existing does Mosheim describe? The Baptist—for his description is applicable to no other.

We have however, still stronger evidences than those recited, to prove that the Welch church was, from the beginning, what is now called Baptist. Near the close of the fifth century (says Benedict *Hist. Bap.* vol. 1, p. 190) Austin, and about forty others, ecclesiastics, were

sent to the spiritual dominion of the Roman church, which was then putting on the garb of popery, since so deeply stained with the blood of the saints. The enterprise succeeded. King Ethelbert, his court, and large numbers of his subjects, gave in their adherence. These romish agents it is said, consecrated the River Swale, near York, in which in one day, they baptized ten thousand of their converts. Having met with so much success in England, they resolved to try what they could do in Wales. They appointed a meeting, which they invited their Pastors to attend. They did so, and Austin made several propositions to them. Among the first was, that they should give baptism to their children, and that they should acknowledge the authority of the Bishop of Rome. Both of these, with several others, they indignantly rejected. Austin and his party, after having made a threatening speech, no part of which have we room to introduce, departed in a rage from the assembly. He proceeded, to glut his vengeance, by inducing the Saxons he had duped, to fall upon the Welch christians, of whom they brutally murdered several thousand. But thousands still survived, and adhered, for their persecutions, as is always the case, but the more closely to the faith, and simplicity of the Gospel. That they were baptists, these facts leave not a shadow of doubt.

We have only space, at present to add that during all the dark ages, and until the reformation, not only in Germany and France, but also in Cornwall, and especially in Wales, the Baptist principles were preserved in an unbroken succession, even until now, of ministers and churches. Numerous martyrs during that period, died on the Gibbet, and in the flames, sealing with their blood the principles of our religion. Indeed the first and last martyr in Britain, were both Baptists. Among their eminent ministers confessors, and martyrs, they number the learned, and celebrated William Tyndal. He was the first man, and we rejoice that a Baptist has that honour, who translated the scriptures into the English language. He commenced the translation into the Welch language, and had finished the pentateuch, when by his popish enemies, who then had the power in England his useful, and brilliant career was arrested, and in 1536, he was murdered for translating the word of God, and preaching against the profligacy of popery. He, himself resided usually at Oxford University, but his residence

It is a fact well known, that soon after the reformation, probably in a great measure, through the instrumentality of the Welch, aiding those who before resided in England, the Baptists spread themselves into all parts of Great Britain. During the time of the Protectorate of Cromwell they were particularly numerous. English Baptists did much in planting the church in these United States, but hardly so much as the Welch. Very large numbers of Welch ministers, and laymen emigrated to New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia &c. In all these places some of our most useful ministers, whose names might be mentioned, as Williams and many others of New York, Morgan, Jones and a very large number of others of Pennsylvania, Thomas and others of Virginia &c. were natives, and many of them ordained in Wales. The churches in the south, to a great extent; were planted and nurtured, by missionaries from these churches to the north. Thus do we see, that not only many parts of Europe but also of the United States, are under God, in a great measure, indebted to the Welch Baptists for the purity in doctrine, and practice which so extensively pervade the church. Roger Williams, the enlightened Governor, and eminent Baptist minister of Rhode Island was a Welchman.

#### SALEM ASSOCIATION.

The twelfth session of the Salem Association was held with the church at Spring Creek, Wilson county, Oct. 3, 4 and 5, 1835. Elder Daniel Smith was chosen Moderator, Elder Joshua Lester was assisted as Clerk, by Elder Wm. Dale. This association has baptized 146, received by letter 50, and restored 4, making an increase of 200; they have dismissed by letter 99, excluded 31, and 43 are dead making a decrease of 173, which subtracted from their total increase, leaves a net increase during the year of 32 members. They number 27 churches, 19 ministers, and 2653 members. The names of their ministers inserted in the minutes are Joshua Lester, Miles West, John Wiseman, Sion Bass, John Jones, Daniel Smith, E. B. Hasie, Elijah Maddox, Wm. C. Bransford, Wm. Dale, Hugh W. Picket, James Bond, Wm. Flowers and E. W. Hall, ordained; and Henry Fite, Archimil Bass, Jesse Johnson, Joseph Paine and Wm. Terril licentates. Perhaps there are others, but these only are named. They we perceive entered into some spiritual measures on the subject of minis-

terial church, Smith county to commence Saturday before the first Lord's day in October 1836. We perceive among their proceedings that they have dropped further correspondence with the Cumberland Association.

#### AN OLD BAPTIST.

An "old Baptist"! We have in the west, many peculiar phrases, not known on the other side of the mountains. This is one of them. *Old*, is with us, a synonym of *orthodox*. An old Baptist! Well—what constitutes an old Baptist? An old Baptist is of course not a Schismatic, a Campbellite, nor a Stoneite. These lay no claim to the honour, and if they did, no one would allow its validity. Still there are four or five divisions among us, who dispute the title with each other. Each claims the cognomen individually and insists upon the exclusive right to be regarded as old Baptists. Much doubt, in this state of things must exist, and each will regard that particular class as old Baptists, in favour of whose views, his mind may happen to be impressed.

An old Baptist, says a friend, is one who believes in the decrees of God; that every thing which occurs is foreordained, and could not possibly have happened otherwise. He abominates all conventions, societies and benevolent efforts, and believes that God not only decrees all his own actions, but also the actions of every man. My minister says, he is an old Baptist, and so fully does he believe this doctrine that he preaches the Gospel only to the elect, for it is determined none others shall believe, and when he sees a man drunk, or going to prison for his crimes, he does not blame him, but says, poor fellow he could not help it, it was decreed he should so act. He believes the commission is fulfilled, that long ago the Gospel has been preached to every creature, and that now the business of the minister is to comfort the church, and not trouble himself about who is saved or lost.

Another friend disputes this claim. He says that an old Baptist is one who eschews all conventions, Bible, Tract, Temperance, and other societies, and believes that the devil is an eternal being. When God made man he was holy, but the devil managed to corrupt him, and his offspring, in such a way as to introduce his seed into the world, and to commingle his descendants among the sons of God, in the race of men. Those who are the sons of God from eternity, will all be saved, whether they live in heathen or christian

those who are the seed of the devil from eternity, no matter where they live, when they die, will all go to their own place, which is to their father the devil. They are his children lineally, spiritually. These believe the Gospel was only made for the Holy seed, and therefore, they agree exactly with the former class and never preach it to sinners, for, as the devil's seed, they have nothing to do with it. These, says he, are old Baptists.

A third friend objects to this conclusion, decidedly. An old Baptist, in his judgment, is one who believes the doctrine of election, is opposed to paying ministers, and distinguishes himself by his zeal against "all the new inventions of the day." He thinks it right to address sinners, but that at the same time, they are spiritually dead as stones. He believes that it is as much trouble for him to go and hear a minister preach, as it is for the minister to go and preach, and that all literary improvement in the ministry is a disadvantage, and much of it ruinous, for then his inspiration will not be so visible. He further believes that if God will have his gospel preached in heathen lands, and destitute places in our own country, he will as in the beginning, raise a persecution against particular ministers, and drive them there, and that he does not do it now, shows that his time has not yet come to preach the gospel in such places. He insists that all who do not agree with him, have "departed from original ground," and are not old Baptists.

A fourth friend strongly objects to all these conclusions. He insists that he is an old Baptist, and that old Baptists hold that no man is elected to salvation till after he is converted; that God never operates upon the heart of a sinner until the sinner resolves to turn to God, and that obedience is the substance of religion. He is strongly opposed to the state convention, refuses his assent to all sorts of societies, and insists they are not to be found in the word of God, and therefore not to be endured.

A fifth friend is a sort of caviller, and has his objections to all. He discourses as follows. The doctrines of divine decrees, and of the election of grace, are certainly maintained by the word of God; but they do not extend to fatality on the one hand, nor admit in the christian of carnal security, or inactivity on the other. He is a sort of stagyrite, and argues in the fashion of Aristotle. He insists, that God's decrees extend only to what he will himself do, in the kingdoms of nature, providence and grace; and that God has not decreed what men will do only in so far as his

for obedience, or disobedience to which they are held responsible at his bar. But if God has decreed all our acts, as well as *his own*, he has not only determined to suffer us to do wrong, but also decreed our evil acts as well as our good ones. He alone therefore, is responsible for our sins. The man who does evil does the will of God as certainly as the man who does good. For he has decreed we should do evil; it was his will therefore, we should do evil, and he never will punish us for doing his will, and therefore for doing evil. Consequently, if God has decreed all our acts, the wicked man is as acceptable to him as the holy man, for they are both alike obedient. This he declares the old Baptists never believed, and therefore, those who hold these doctrines are not old Baptists.

Our criticising friend cannot brook the two seed doctrine for many important reasons, some of which cannot be named in the audience of "ears polite;" but the very *smallest* objection he has is *overwhelming*. It is no less than that this doctrine dethrones deity, and elevates the devil in his place. It is a fundamental article, with this class, that the devil is an eternal being. If he be eternal, he must from the necessity of the case, be self-existent and independant. There is but one being who is eternal, independant, and self-existing, and that being is God; but the devil is eternal, independant, and self-existing, therefore the devil is God. There is but one God, the devil is God, therefore there is no God but the devil. He goes into the absurdities no further, but contends that no old Baptist ever believed such abominations, therefore no two seeder ever was an old Baptist.

That those who refuse to preach the Gospel to sinners, in which several of these classes agree, our caviller assures us fall, thereby, into absurdities not much less atrocious than those already condemned. He demonstrates his positions for the sake of convenience, by syllogistic argument. The Gospel is to be preached only to the elect say they. Very well. Christ says of those to whom the Gospel is preached, he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned. According to the doctrine assumed the Gospel is to be preached only to the elect. We find, by looking at the commission, and comparing it with the doctrine this double absurdity, that some of the elect, to whom the Gospel is preached will not believe (he that believeth not) and some of them will be damned. He that believeth not shall be damned. He insists therefore, if the Bible be true, that the Gospel is to be

preached to sinners. Old Baptists are Bible christians, therefore, those who refuse to preach the Gospel to sinners are not old Baptists.

To the third, and fourth claimant, our friend objects with equal earnestness. He insists that all old Baptists believe fully in the doctrine of divine sovereignty, and that salvation is entirely of Grace; that ministers are called of God to preach, are bound to give themselves wholly to the work, and for their support, are to receive of "the vernal things" of those for whom they administer "spiritual things." Those who deny this cannot be old Baptists, for these doctrines they have uniformly received.

Our friend in opposition to all these classes, declares himself in favour of the convention, &c. &c. and pledges himself to prove that all old Baptists agree with him, and therefore no opposer of these things has a right to be considered an old Baptist. On this subject, he argues at length.

The church of Christ, is his representative on earth. He says he has heard old Baptists preach, that the church is the bride of Christ; and say that, when the husband goes from home, he places his affairs in the hands of his wife, with particular directions what to do; and if she loves him he will obey his instructions. Christ came into the world to save sinners, and having made the atonement, his design was to have the knowledge of it carried into all the world. This part of the work can be done by his bride; and having arranged all the particulars of his Gospel, and given his church or bride particular instructions to carry on his designs, and accomplish his purposes of grace, he ascended up where he was before, and left it in charge with his church to have the gospel preached to every creature which he was to bless and by that means extend the knowledge of himself into all the world. For this purpose he gave to his church servants, called ministers, subject to the authority of the church, as the church cannot all go and preach, to go for them, and preach under their directions, and to preach not themselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and themselves the servants of the church for Jesus sake. The church therefore, is an organization of Christ, the principal design of which is to extend, by the blessing of God, the Gospel over the whole world, and see that their servants preach it to every creature, and the spirit of God is sent into the world and is ever present to bless. If it be the duty of the church, as a whole to do these things, they may certainly meet together, at some convenient place, to consult and

ascertain where the gospel has been preached and where not, and act in concert in accomplishing this end; and this concert is a coming together or, what is the same thing, a Convention. This is the whole object of a convention, and if it embrace in its territory a whole state, it is a State Convention, it is made up exclusively of Baptists; therefore, it is a Baptist State Convention.

Our friend declares that these are Bible principles, and all old Baptists are Bible christians, and he contends that those who thus believe and act are old Baptists, and those who refuse, are not old Baptists. But the others disagree; each still insists that his own class are the only true old Baptists. The question therefore is not settled, and the enquiry has yet to be decided—"What constitutes an Old Baptist?"

#### DISCONTINUANCES.

We are perfectly astounded with the number of discontinuances of The Baptist. They have been coming in for a week or two, by scores, almost daily. We have not counted them, but we are certain they must amount to near two hundred. What is remarkable in this matter is that they are *nearly*, we may say they are all *ministers*, and *members* of the Baptist Church who discontinue!

Our friends will undoubtedly ask, what can be their reason for this? To explain their reasons, and afford a specimen of their manner of expressing them, we will give an extract of a letter not as bad as some, but of medium character just received. It will be remarked that they generally call us *Mr.* or *Parson*, or any thing rather than *Brother*.  
"Mr. Howell,

"Sir:—You will please discontinue my name from your list, as I am not disposed to pay money to encourage the Baptists to fall out by the way. I have had an intimate acquaintance with the old United Baptists, for the last twenty years, and never saw half the contention, till so much light came from the east; and some of you smart folks would wish to make the Baptists, in this country believe they are in the back ground for want of information" &c. Here it grows worse and we will not quote it. We would ask if those who wish to discontinue cannot do so without giving us unnecessary pain? The scriptures command—"Be courteous"—and the man who disregards the injunction is criminal.

We refer to this subject, however, mainly to make known the state of our affairs in relation to The Baptist, to the friends of true principles in this part of the country. Our

to a weekly; and indeed if it continues at all, those who feel an interest in the existence of a medium of communication in Tennessee, must obtain more subscribers. Will not the friends of the cause do this?

We take occasion here to say that those who wish to discontinue, and do not advise us of it before we issue the February number will be considered subscribers for the second volume.

#### ELDER PATRICK'S ESSAY.

The essay which follows from Elder Patrick, has been on hand for some time. We publish it, because, notwithstanding its thousand and one absurdities, it is the best anti-effort essay we recollect to have seen. The style is handsome; the temper, with some exceptions which we shall notice, astonishingly mild for a production on that side of the question; and the arguments, although, as we shall briefly show, entirely fallacious, are thrown together with much ingenuity. Elder Patrick is no doubt, himself deceived by them. We have no personal acquaintance with him, but we judge from the spirit manifested at the close of his essay, that when truth is brought to bear on his mind, he will not finally resist its force, and that yet he may exert his powers in a better cause than that which he now advocates. We indeed, owe him an apology for our delay in its publication, but we have been so much pressed with other matter, that it could not sooner appear. In the mean time, we showed it to Father Whitsett, who returned it with his thoughts on its topics annexed, which we also publish. These are sufficient for the purposes of a reply, but we will not suppress the inclination we feel to say a few things, by way of preparing the mind of the reader for the essay.

Elder Patrick has many objections to our State Convention, and indeed to all "the benevolent operations of the day."

1. He first objects to the name, because he says, he had not learned that the church had given authority to form such a body. Well, he ought to have known this. They had the authority of the church; and what is better they had the authority of Christ, and the Apostolic churches. All this will be seen if not fully in our subsequent remarks, at least in due time. But even were it otherwise, what intelligent man is influenced by a name. "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet."

2. Elder Patrick objects to the Convention because as he contends its government over the ministry in appointing them a particular

place in which to labour, is such as belongs to God alone.

In reply we remark, that he is utterly misinformed in relation to this matter. No such authority as he asserts is used. Christ has called, and sent them to preach, and he requires them to preach "to every creature." Where they are most needed, therefore, is their proper place; and as "the field is the world," they are not likely to be sent by the Convention, out of the proper field. Besides the Convention never sends a man into a field, which he does not feel it his duty to occupy. The Convention does not pretend, as he declares they do, to take out of the hands of God the authority to send ministers; on the contrary, they only aid them according to the divine command, to occupy the field to which the Lord has sent them. So that all brother Patrick's arguing on that point has no relation to the subject and is entirely lost, because it is built on the supposition that the Convention does what they entirely disclaim any pretence of doing.

3. He objects to the Convention on the ground that it produces divisions. We remark in reply, that if this is a valid objection, it was used by the Jews against Christ with more force than it is now by our anti-effort brethren against the Convention, for the christian religion produced, in the same way that the Convention does, unbounded dissensions. Ahab said to Elisha, on the same grounds relied upon by Elder P. and with the same propriety, "Art thou he that troubleth Israel?"

4. Brother Patrick, on the subject of the "operation" of the Convention, which he makes his fourth objection, bothers himself by his manner of stating the thing. The Convention says to the people do you give us money and we will give you the gospel. The fact is, the Convention never says any such thing. They do not propose to give any one the gospel, nor to sell them the gospel. The Convention proposes to the people to contribute money to buy bread for the wives and children of ministers, who are now obliged to stay at home and work for it, and assures them if they do so, the Convention will receive and be the almoners of their bounty, and the ministers thus having their hands loosed from worldly care, will have time to come and preach the gospel to them and others that are destitute.

5. All Elder P. says on the subject of voluntary, and obligatory contribution contracts, obligor and obligee, is utterly absurd, of no consequence at all and therefore requires no remark.

6. Brother P. undertakes to prove that ministers are not to be supported by the church, in a pecuniary point of view. On this point also we leave him to the good sense of the community. A matter so palpably plain as this and the truth of which has been demonstrated five thousand times over need not again be proved. It is now too late to start such an absurdity, because every page of the Bible contradicts it. We notice however, what palpable absurdities the opponents of the Convention are obliged to assume, or have no argument against that body.

7. Another objection is that money is required to obtain membership in the Convention. He insists that fellowship, and not money, is the true right of membership. Brother P. gets his head into the clouds here, by arguing upon the ground that the church, and the Convention, are either identical in every respect, or utterly inimical to each other. He would argue just as logically were he to contend, that because a planter cultivates his cotton with a weeding hoe, he must therefore, pick out his cotton with a weeding hoe. If it was right for early christians, in obedience to the instructions of Paul, to lay by them every week, on the first day of the week, some amount, regulated by the extent of the prosperity afforded them of God, for benevolent purposes, it is not wrong for us to do so. And if after we do so, we condescend (convention) to appropriate it, as instructed in the scriptures we may, if we please, refuse to give our charities into the hands of those for distribution who will do nothing personally, but decide to bestow it ourselves as we think God requires. As we make it necessary also, that all who join us have fellowship in the church, brother P. cannot object on that ground. And if those who do not contribute convene with us, they are always invited to seats. This is the whole mystery of the operation, and we confess ourselves unable to perceive how it resembles (is not that rather a malicious remark, Brother Patrick!) "Tetzel's selling indulgencies." As to life memberships, no such thing now exists. Still he says, if he could be convinced that ministers are authorised to receive any thing for preaching, he would waive all these objections, and "be an effort Baptist." Shall we, to make him "an effort Baptist," attempt to convince him? No we will not. For if a man at mid-day, and in a clear sky, declares, again and again, he cannot see the sun, and makes that a reason for not going to work as he ought to do, and then sets about proving to us that there is no sun, shall we argue with him? No we again say we will not. We will just ask,

he never receive any thing for preaching! Does he not now often receive money, on other grounds than his preaching!

8. Brother P. objects to the Convention, because it is "a monied institution." Very well—let him stick to that, and we will see where it will lead him. He does not, we presume object to associations, and they are "monied institutions!" Do you ask for proof? We will give it by asking if each has not a Treasurer? And are not contributions expected, and received from the churches annually? He must leave the associations, for his objections stand as strong against them, as against the Convention. He is a member of the church, and yet the church is a monied institution! Oh no, no! says he. But stop a moment—reflect—we ask if the church has not a Treasurer? If they expect no money from their members or have nothing to do with it, therefore appoint a Treasurer? And where is the church without its Treasurer! But the Convention durst not have a Treasurer. The objection also stands against the church with equal force. If it be said, they use very little money indeed. We reply the amount of money, little or much, does not affect the principle. Now Elder P. is driven either to give up the church, or his argument, he may take his choice. Elder P's expositions of scripture in connexion with this part of his argument, are of a piece with his argument. They serve to illustrate the remark that "a drowning man will catch at a straw." The expositions about the various "funds" are absolutely so self-contradictory and suicidal, that we must not spoil them by comment. But we will notice one of his comments on a passage in the Epistles.

Paul tells the Corinthians (2 Cor. II. 8.) He had robbed other churches taking wages of them to do them service. Attempting, as brother Patrick does, to prove that ministers are not to be supported, this is a poser; he feels it, and consequently occupies a whole page, in his manuscript, in explaining it away. He proves that Paul did receive wages while for preaching, but he found out at last, it was wrong and asked forgiveness. Then we suppose he would not fall into the same error again. But we soon after see him at the old trade, again receiving money from the churches. That which was lacking to me, the churches of Macedonia supplied. What a money-loving man Paul must have been. He was always falling into the crime of receiving money for preaching. And we do not where hear of his asking forgiveness. Paul asked the Corinthians to forgive him, not as Elder P. declares for receiving wages from

other churches while he preached to them, but because he was remiss in not requiring them to do all they could themselves but after a while he grows bold in his sin, and declares that it was right to receive money, telling the churches, that if they had received of the ministers spiritual things, it was right for them to administer to the preachers of their carnal things. Into this predicament does brother P. throw Paul by his ingenious exposition gotten up against the Convention. We give this only as a specimen and leave the rest to the reader.

9. Another objection against the Convention is that they give their Evangelists they support the specific sum of "twenty dollars a month." The idea of wages, we think, it will be admitted, carries the impression of a specific sum. Paul, while he was committing according to brother P. the crime of receiving wages from several churches, to pay him for preaching to the Corinthians, which he did a year and a half; while a church in that town was being raised, received a specific sum. If the Convention fell into an error in contributing specifically twenty dollars a month, they erred with Paul; and though we have now abolished the practice, and resolved to give according to the necessities of ministers, should we relapse into the same error hereafter, and finally think it right, we shall still have Paul with us. The laborers in the vineyard all received a penny a day.

In that part of his essay in which he represents the friends of the Convention as not preaching Christ, but perpetually crying out "MONEY—MONEY—more MONEY," he may not have designed it, but he has unquestionably slandered us, every one who ever heard a Convention preacher will know this, and we think on reading over his essay, he will himself be sensible of the fact.

As a concluding argument brother Patrick undertakes to prove—now, what do you think? Why, that the commission of Christ to his apostles has been long ago fulfilled, that the Gospel has been preached to every creature, and that the end has come!! He quotes Col. 2 c. 23 v. We would here fill a whole page with notes of admiration, could they at all express our surprise, but it is boundless. We refer the reader to the essay. Any remark on our part, to show the error of this doctrine, would betray a suspicion of the good sense of our readers. We shall therefore be silent.

We suppose that brother Patrick must be aware that in nearly all his views, on this whole subject, he differs infinitely more than we do from his anti-effort brethren as a body. They, we are confident, will never sustain his

views. The most that any intelligent anti-effort brother has urged against us, is that we are doing a right thing in a wrong way. They all believe that the gospel has yet to be preached to every creature in every succeeding generation, until the millenium, and that ministers ought to be supported. But he contends that ministers ought not to be supported, that the gospel has been preached to every creature, and that the end has come. Of course all future preaching is a work of supererogation, and, what is more strange, we are all living after the end of world. If it be supposed, and we admit no part of it, that by doing a right thing in a wrong way, we have so erred, that they ought to separate from us, much more ought they to separate from brother Patrick because, in this whole doctrine on the subject, he contradicts the whole system equally believed by both them and ourselves. We hope, however that before any of these separating measures are taken, all our brethren will pause, ascertain what is truth, and make the necessary efforts to harmonize upon the only safe or desirable foundation, the truth of the gospel. We wish now to imitate brother Patrick, in one thing. It is in the expression of our good feelings. We have intended "no harshness" in any thing we have said, and we hope he will receive our remarks, in the same spirit of kindness with which they are dictated.

For The Baptist,

CHERRYVILLE, TENNESSEE, }  
Sept. 4, 1835. }

Brother Howell:

Since writing to you before, I have been re-examining my objections to what is called the "benevolent operations of the day," and have not yet found any reason, why I should abandon my former course and join the ranks of those called "Effort Baptists." So far as I have become acquainted with the subject by reading the communications in "The Baptist," and the information concerning conventions of other states, and comparing all the information that I have been able to obtain, with the scriptures and what I have always understood to be the course of the Baptists, I think the convention (or the members forming it) have erred in several instances.

1st. In regard to the name "Baptist Convention." By what authority it is called the "Baptist Convention." I am at a loss to determine as it was not authorized by the church. And that it was not authorized by the church, I am authorized to say, by the shewing of the convention. For in a circular letter it is said, "shall we ask of the church to do right." (I quote from memory and may not have given the precise words, but substantially I think) which evidently shows that there was (to say the best) no authority given by the church for its origination. And if not originated by church authority, it is improperly called "Baptist Convention," since no association

nor meeting, is properly a Baptist association or meeting, without church authority. I am willing to admit that it is a "Convention of Baptists" acting without church authority, for which they are amenable to the church, inasmuch as they have formed a society under the name of "Convention" quite different from and unauthorized by her, yet claiming her name and authority.

2nd. Its government over the ministry, which belongs neither to convention, association, nor church, as it regards the appointing of the field of labor. That the convention does exercise government over the ministry is beyond the possibility of a doubt. For the convention says to A, thou shalt preach in the counties of B, C and D. I will now undertake to show that the government over the ministry is wrong. 1st. It is agreed that "God calls, qualifies and sends men to preach." Now if it be admitted that this is true, it must be admitted that he appoints the field of their labour. Matt. 10, Luke 10. From other quotations it evidently appears that Jesus did assign them the field of their labour, and if he did, without he has surrendered this right since, it yet of right belongs to him, and not to the convention, and that the right is not surrendered is proven by all who "are called of God, as was Aaron." God said to a certain church "separate me Paul and Barnabas, unto the work whereunto I have called them." I also recollect that at one time Paul wished to visit a certain place, but was prevented by him under whose control he was. At another time Paul was directed to go, and the church tried to dissuade him from it, but prevailed not. From all of which I infer, that the government over the ministry belongs to God and not to conventions, associations, nor churches. And if it belong to God and not to the convention it is wrong for the convention to assume this government. The convention has done this, therefore the convention has done wrong. The wrong is this. The convention has undertaken to do that which God never intended to be done by any but himself.

3rd. Its product. It produces division, strife and angry contentions. That the "efforts" are doing this needs no argument to prove. For it will be recollected that the church was in peace on the points of practice, until the convention commenced its operations. And immediately thereupon we find the Baptists a divided people and recognized as "effort" and "anti-effort." Indeed in one of the addresses made by the convention, this fact is acknowledged. "We do not like to be considered even the remote cause of division." (quoted again from memory.) You then, my brethren, of the convention, have by your own showing, and by the union prevalent among the Baptists anterior to the origin of the convention and the division subsequent to it and consequent thereupon, been the cause of divisions and offences. You may object to this, by saying "the Baptists have always been divided on this subject, and we therefore did not cause divisions &c., but only made manifest the existing difference of opinion." So might Mr. Campbell and all others plead who have brought distress & confusion into the Baptist ranks, "Mark them that cause divisions." &c.

4th. Its operations by which these are produced, seems to be this, you (the people) give us the convention money, and we will give you the gospel, by sending missionaries, &c.

Now sir, it is alleged by some that this money is to be raised by "voluntary contribution," and others affirm it to be "by virtue of an obligation that we owe to God." Neither of which am I prepared to believe. 1st. Is it by "voluntary contributions." Now if I understand correctly what is meant by a voluntary contribution, it is "to give just what a person pleases irrespected of any obligation whatever." Now by reference to the manner of raising funds by the convention, it will be clearly seen that it is not by virtue of "voluntary contributions;" because in an indirect manner the amount is extorted by requiring so much for membership, by paying "one dollar" an individual is entitled to "membership for one year." Or by paying "Ten dollars" a life membership is obtained. (This looks to me like Tetzal's selling indulgencies.) Now we see where an individual is induced to give for the sake of reward, it is a contract. The convention promises a remuneration for the money received, therefore it is a contract and not a voluntary contribution, which will lead us to examine the scriptures. 2d. By virtue of "obligation to God." Now, sir, to admit this obligation would be to do away all the arguments in favour of voluntary contributions. To my mind it is very clear that an obligation in a pecuniary point of view embraces the following facts. "An obligor, an obligee, and the amount due from the obligor to the obligee, and the time when the payment should be made." Now, sir, to admit this would prove too much for those even who contend for it. Because the discharge of an obligation never does lay the obligee under any obligation to the obligor, for the obligor has done nothing but what he was bound to do, nor has the obligee received any thing but his right; consequently, cannot be bound to the obligor for an act of remuneration. A owes B one hundred dollars. A discharges the obligation. Now is B bound to give A an equivalent for the hundred dollars? I say not. Now if God has laid us under obligation to pay the convention or minister one, or ten dollars, our payment thus made will not lay the convention nor minister under obligation to the pay unless, it can be proven that the discharge of one obligation begets a correspondent obligation. I would furthermore remark that it is no where said, what amount is due the preacher in consequence of an "obligation we owe to God," nor it is stated at what period the payment is to be made. And, to say the least, I doubt much whether it can be proven by the scriptures, that the church is under pecuniary obligation to the preacher. Now to me it appears that the argument (if indeed it be argument) used above, will clearly show that there is at least some incongruity in your doctrine and practice. Because the funds are raised by virtue of obligation we owe to God (as is pretended) and the discharge of that obligation, lays the receive under obligation to the payor. If the convention has rightfully ascertained the amount due, and the times at which payment is to be made, I

should be glad to know from what source obtained this information; I am taught by Bible to believe that fellowship is the ground upon which individuals are received in Baptist societies irrespective of money. admission into the convention as a member for the sake of MONEY and not fellowship. The convention says, fellowship for the effort brethren who are not members, nor are they be without they pay "one" or "ten dollars." Now if this payment be not made, there is no membership, but by paying the required amount, you may be members. I will ask is it fellowship or money that admits membership in the convention? As an individual, I must think that is not a serious course, because the scriptures nowhere prohibit monied institutions, and require the payment of a certain sum for admission there. If so, I have not so read it, and would be glad for some person to refer me to the scriptures requiring it. But if it cannot be done, one ought to insist upon a person to do that which the scriptures know nothing about.

5th. The doctrine of the convention, I understand it to be, "God has required of the church the support of the ministry, in order that the gospel may be preached; and without which it cannot be preached unto all the world," &c. The examination of this subject will bring the "effort" and "anti-effort" brethren together, or forever keep them apart. Could I be convinced of the truth of this doctrine, I would be an effort baptist. But not being convinced of its truth, I must yet remain to be what is called "anti-effort." On the subject of this doctrine, I have my views and opinions, which when delivered, if condemnable, condemn me. I should I see the just condemnation, I will forsake the error of my ways and ask forgiveness. It appears that when the blessed Redeemer was here on earth, as he went from place to place doing good, he called "twelve men to be Apostles, for the purpose of" witnessing both what he said and did, "in order that they might teach others the same." We find him on every fit occasion instructing them; in regard to their mission. Instructing them when, where and how to go, and where not to go. In examining Matt. 6 ch. from the 24th to the 34th verse, inclusive, may be found that kind of instruction wholly subversive of the doctrine of the convention. We here find the Apostles admonished to "take no thought for food, raiment" &c. I would ask if the preachers of the convention do the same? I answer, No. For proof of which, let us look at both in their actions &c. The Apostles started and went to preach "taking no thought for what they should eat, drink, nor wear." No wages (money) offered nor promised as a consequence of their labor. By whom were they sent? Jesus. Where were they sent? "The lost sheep of the house of Israel." What were they to do? Preach. Preach what? The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. What preparation was made for their support? Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass, nor scrip, &c. Matt. 10 ch.

Does the preacher of the convention do so too? Let us see. He starts with a pledge from the convention that he shall receive twenty dollars per month. Thus he takes

thought" for "what he shall eat, drink and wear." who says go! Convention. Where shall I go? into the counties of B, C and D. What shall I preach? Preach about Jesus, of a good deal about the excellency of conversion purposes, and how noble a thing it is to give for the support of the gospel. What preparation is made? A convention has been formed, and supplies their preacher in consequence of the contract. We in this contract, find the difference between the Apostles and modern Missionaries. We see also where the Apostles received their first commission, as recorded in Matt. 10 ch., to preach the gospel in Jewry that the doctrine proclaimed in the 6 chap. of Matthew, is entered (and substantially recapitulated) and practically illustrated in this commission. In which it evidently appears that they (the Apostles) neither received nor required, so much per day, week, month nor year. And when hire be mentioned in connexion with this subject, (and it is) it is so explained as to be entirely subversive of the meaning given of it in the doctrine of the convention, in Luke, 10 chap., 7 verse, we find the commission recorded again, with the addition of the following sentence. "The laborer is worthy of his hire." I ask if the word "hire" mentioned in this text, means so much wages for a day, week, month or year? Let Luke answer. "And in the same house remain, eating and drinking such things as they give for the laborer is worthy of his hire." From which it evidently appears that by "hire" is only meant such things as should be given them "to eat and drink," while they continued in that house. If any thing more is meant, it is not expressed, nor do I think it implied. We then see the Apostles going over Jewry, and hear them preach "saying the kingdom of God is at hand" taking no thought what they shall eat—what they shall drink—nor wherewithal they shall be clothed. Depending entirely upon the words of the Saviour, "your Heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things." They return. The Saviour asked "what lacked ye?" "They said nothing." "The devils were subject unto them." Peace followed their footsteps into whatsoever house they were received. Now let us see and hear from the return and report of our effort brethren: for they who have made tours over the field of labour assigned them by the convention. Now "what lacked ye?" MONEY, MONEY! more MONEY! We want more laborers, and without money we cannot obtain such as are worth sustaining. We want a publication society! We want a missionary in China! We want a Theological School, to educate young men for the ministry, for in this enlightened day our ministers are too ignorant—not more than twenty out of all the Baptist preachers in this State are fit to preach in towns. What success attends them? Great indeed! At such a camp meeting so many were converted, and at such a meeting so many more! But alack! and alas! "the devils are" not "subject to us." For this they stir up our ignorant "anti-effort" brethren to oppose us. Instead of peace following our footsteps, we see discord and disunion manifesting itself. Wherefore? Because of our efforts. (This is my answer.) How very

dissimilar to the report of the Apostles! But we will pursue the subject. After this Jesus informed them that he must be crucified, and that this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come. I will endeavor to consider the declarations made in this text, according to my view of the case. 1st. "The Gospel shall be preached in all the world." How is this to be accomplished? The same directions already given stand unaltered, except in this: "Let him that hath a purse take it" (a certain brother advocating the propriety of the things against which I contend, said as I am informed, "that it should be an empty purse, in order that it should be filled." If this be true, I cannot see why those who had no purse should not have been required to prepare one.) But if he had no purse he must go. When the first commission was enlarged for the purpose of fulfilling the things declared in the last quoted text, it was said unto the Apostles, (and not unto the church as some say) "Go ye into all the world," &c. Do we now find a fund raised for their support as missionaries? I have as yet read of none in the scriptures. But I have read in the Acts of the Apostles of a certain sum, stock, fund, or whatever else it may be called, raised quite differently and for quite different purposes, from the funds of the convention. It seems that the "multitude of Apostles" (preachers and laity) sold their possessions, lands, &c. and held not back ought of any thing they had, nor counted it their own. Do the members of the convention do so? Oh! no. One dollar will do for some, and ten dollars for others! Taking this fund for our example this will not do, unless those sums be the worth of the individuals. You must not keep back any thing, or you will do as did Ananias and Sapphira. Did not the "multitude of disciples" all partake of this fund, and was it not raised for the express purpose of supporting them all as one family? Surely it was, Acts 2 chap., 44 and 45 verses, 5 ch., from the 32 to 37 inclusive, 6 chap. 1, 2 and 3 verses conclusively prove this. Who composed the multitude of disciples? Men and their wives, widows, &c. as well as the Apostles. There is one other fact connected with this fund which should not be overlooked. They were under no obligation to raise this fund! That this is true appears from the words of Peter to Ananias, Acts 5 ch. 4 verse. So this was given by others, for their example for raising funds, we receive it at their hands and learn from it the error of our brethren. Inasmuch as this fund is used as an argument in favour of raising funds, I think it will not answer the purpose unless those who use it should follow "the pattern." That this is done I presume none will contend. Where is the brother who has sold his possessions or his lands, and brought the whole of his worth and given it to the convention for a fund, out of which for men, women; (widows), &c. to be supported and over which he ceases to have any control? Where is the family of Baptists, believers living together after the same manner? No where. Then tell us no more of this fund until you go and do as they did. Again, if those believers were under no obligation to raise this fund, but did it at

their own option, how infatuated must that mind be, which would undertake to use this as an argument to show an existing obligation, when it is said there was none. Acts 5 ch. 4 v. This fund was not raised for ministerial support alone, nor for the purpose of spreading the gospel, but for the purpose of supporting those by and for whom it was raised. Jews and Greeks, men, women and widows. Now had it been raised for ministerial support or for the purpose of spreading the gospel, the ministers or Apostles might have said to murmuring Grecians, cease your murmuring, for the fund was raised for us and not for your neglected widows. When I see men driven to such resorts, in order to sustain themselves it looks to me like drowning men, catching at straws." Once more as to this fund. If it were raised for missionary purposes, it did not subserve the purposes for which it was raised. For not long after this time persecution scattered the Apostles abroad, and some of them to a considerable distance from this fund, and if any of it were sent after them we have no account of it. "The twelve" then "well said it is not meet for us to leave the word of God and serve tables." What is meant, by tables in the text! Surely an allusion is made to the different meals, at which the Grecian widows were neglected, otherwise, I cannot see any propriety in the remedy proposed by the twelve. I would therefore say it is not right for ministers to leave the word of God and serve tables, by taking thought what they shall "eat, drink," &c. According to what is shown, the "efforts" are doing this, which they, as well as the twelve, say ought not to be done. "Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that which he alloweth." I am afraid to institute a comparison between this fund, and that of the convention, lest I shall find on the side of the convention that which was hidden among the "camel's furniture." But to proceed. The next fund is recorded in Acts 11 chap. 29 v. and was raised in consequence of the prophecy of Agabus. "Then every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea." 30 v. "which also they did and sent by the hands of Barnabas and Saul." About the intention of raising the fund, there could be but one opinion. It was raised for the relief of those suffering saints in Judea. After this we find funds or contributions frequently spoken of, but in reference to this subject, and this alone, (the relief of the poor saints) except those received by Paul when a prisoner at Rome, &c. I am apprized that many texts are relied upon to prove those things, for which the convention contends, some of which I will look at, if I cannot examine them. Paul said to the Corinthians, that he had, "robbed other churches, taking wages of them to do you service." 2 Cor. 11 chap., 8 v. By this text we learn that Paul declares what he had done, and what the consequence thereof was to the Corinthians, verse 13. "For what is it wherein ye were inferior to other churches, except it be, that I myself was not burdensome to you? forgive me this wrong." It seems for some cause Paul says they were inferior to other churches. I now ask for the cause. Was it in their acts toward him, or in his towards them? It cer-

tainly must be in his act towards them, for he asks forgiveness for the wrong done by himself, which wrong was his having "received wages from others" to do them service, by which he kept himself from being "burdensome" unto them. It may be thought that this construction is a forced one. Then let us examine it more particularly. It could only be, as is shown therein, his wrong. Then was it wrong in him not to be burdensome? If so, he declares in the 14th verse, that he will do the same thing. Can we suppose for a moment, that an Apostle would ask forgiveness for a thing, a wrong, in one breath, and in the next, declare that he will do the same thing? Was it wrong for him to cause them to be inferior? If so, I ask on what their inferiority consisted? I answer in his own language, "That I myself was not burdensome to you," which clearly and conclusively proves that the wrong was in his having received wages from other churches, to do them service. Now if the wages received by Paul from the other churches, to do the Corinthians service, was not wrong, why did Paul ask forgiveness for the wrong done in this, towards them, by which, they were "inferior to other churches"? And that it was wrong I have the testimony of Paul, who said "forgive me this wrong." Now if it were wrong for Paul to receive wages from other churches to do the Corinthians service, it must be wrong for any minister, now to receive wages from one church, or from churches to do others "service." It was wrong for Paul, therefore it is wrong for any others to do so. Then my brethren do as Paul did, ask forgiveness. If those texts prove any thing concerning the convention, it is clear to me that the proof is against the convention. I know that great reliance is placed also on 1 Cor. 9th chap. to prove the righteousness of ministerial support &c. &c. But, as I have already written more than I intended at this time, I will not now attempt to offer any arguments on this text, but will simply ask, did Paul by "the flock" the "vineyard" and "muzzled ox" design to show that ministers of right ought to be sustained, or did he not rather intend to show, that which he claims in the 4th, 5th and 6th verses? These questions may in all probability surprise a great many persons, but let me simply remark, that I have long since thought, (and have been satisfied with the thought) that the Apostles designed by the "flock" "vineyard" and "muzzled ox" to show that inasmuch as he was the "ox" by whom the Corinthians were trodden out, that he had a right to claim them his "epistle written and engraven in his heart" and therefore "would rejoice over them." I will now give the other propositions a passing notice, and drop the subject for the present. This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations, and then shall the end come. The first proposition I have considered in part and I will now remark that the gospel has been "preached in all the world, for a witness unto all nations." Col. 2 chap. 23 v. Irrespective of any monied institutions, and that God has witnessed his goodness unto his people, on "whom his name was called" long since, according to the dictation of the text that I have been considering, and the "end" has "come". Not the end of the gospel dis-

persation, but of the Jewish nation "the temple" &c. The Jews have long since been deprived of their temple, their national advantages, &c. and have become "a text and a proverb, among all the rest of the nations" &c. From which I learn that God has, "according to his eternal purposes, purposed in Christ Jesus before the world began," heretofore caused the gospel to be preached in all the world, not by virtue of money, but by suffering persecution to rage, and has continued it where it is, and will in his own good time send it, to others (if indeed he have a people among them) to China, &c. &c. But should it ever be sent, it will be sent as heretofore by persecutions, and not by money. (These things I conceive to be susceptible of the clearest proof and demonstration.) In concluding this letter I will remark, with due regard to the feelings of all concerned (and the remarks are not made in anger nor ill will) that while a good number of my brethren are looking for a better state of things, to exist as the consequence of the "benevolent operations of the day." I am looking for, and at no distant day, worse times, when we shall see as the consequence of these things, persecution raging, by which many who are now contemned as niggardly, covetous, &c. will perhaps have to carry the glad tidings to heathen lands &c.

I do not wish to be understood to say, that I think or harbor the most distant idea, that this is the object had in view by my "effort" brethren: No, no. I have a better opinion of them than that, notwithstanding we differ (and I think honestly), I am exceedingly unwilling to believe, or say any thing of them, but what is warranted by the word of God. I have no hesitancy in saying, that many, very many, of the "effort" brethren are eminent servants of God, and would be as unwilling to bring about that state of things at which I have hinted, as my "anti-effort" brethren would. But men may be mistaken, and may use means for the accomplishment of a certain good and desirable object, which means may not subserve the purposes of the good and well intended man. This I really think to be the case of my "effort" brethren. I have not written for the sake of controversy, nor indeed for any other purpose but the one, and it is this, should my objections be fairly removed and I undeceived, (if indeed I am deceived,) and truth requires that I should be an "effort baptist" according to the convention, I will be without a murmur. Should this find a place in the columns of the Baptist, you and others are at liberty to make such remarks upon it as may be thought to answer and remove my objections. One thing I request (of any person who may notice this communication) not to misapply my proofs, and arguments (if any I have used) to any purpose other than that for which I have used them. Pardon any and every thing that has the appearance of harshness, for harshness is not intended.

I shall in all probability continue to make my thoughts and views known through your paper (if permitted) until I shall have said as much as I think necessary.

Your's

in hope of immortality,  
WILLIAM PATRICK.

REPLY TO THE ABOVE BY ELDER WHITING.

As I am about to reply to a treatise written by one who is professedly an anti-Baptist. I will set down an article of faith which we both profess to believe. "The Old and New Testaments are the word of God and the only rule of faith and practice."

Under the first head, I state the following facts.

1st. There were men, anciently called "able ministers of the New Testament." Cor. III. 6. The following quotations prove the outlines of their general character. "It is not reason that we should leave the word of God, and serve tables," "But give ourselves continually to prayer, and to the ministry of the word," Acts VI. 5, 4. "And daily in the temple, and in every house, ceased not to teach and preach Jesus Christ," Acts V. 42. "I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have shewed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, testifying both to the Jews, and also the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." "Therefore watch and remember that by the space of three years, I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears." Acts XX. 20, 21, 31. "Give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine, meditate upon these things, give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all," 1 Tim. IV. 13, 15. "No man that warreth entangleth himself with the things of this life; that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier." "Study to shew thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth," 2 Tim. II; 4, 15.

2d. That those ministers above described, mostly had families, the following quotations will prove. "Have we not the power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas," 1 Cor. IX, 5. "A bishop thus must be blameless, the husband of one wife," 1 Tim. III. 2. "Blameless the husband of one wife, having faithful children," Titus I. 6.

3rd. To sustain such ministers is pecuniary matters, the Lord stands pledged. "And Jesus walking by the sea of Galilee, saw two brethren, Simon called Peter and Andrew his brother, casting a net into the sea; for they were fishers. And he said unto them follow me, and I will make you fishers of men. And they straightway left their nets and followed him." Matt IV. 18, 19, 20. "And as Jesus passed forth from thence, he saw a man named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom: and he saith unto him, follow me. And he arose and followed him." IX. 9. "And he said unto another, follow me. But he said, Lord, suffer me first to go and bury my father. Jesus said unto him, let the dead bury their dead: but go thou and preach the kingdom of God." Luke IX.

59, 60. "Therefore take no thought saying, what shall we eat, or what shall we drink, or wherewithal shall we be clothed, for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things." Matt. XI. 31, 32.

4th. That the church is enjoined to redeem this pledge, the following witnesses will prove. "And the king shall answer, and say unto them. Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me." Matt. XXV. 40. "Who goeth to warfare any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock? If we have given unto you spiritual things; is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things? Do ye not know, that they which minister about holy things live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord ordained, that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel." 1 Cor. IX. 7, 11, 13, 14. "Let him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that teacheth in all good things. Be not deceived; God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Gal. VI. 6, 7. "Let the Elders that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in word and doctrine, for the scripture saith, thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn; and, the labourer is worthy of his reward." 1 Tim. V. 17, 18.

5th. The work the Lord Jesus Christ gave his ministers was, that they should preach the gospel to every creature, and continue so to do, as is proved by their commission. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen." Matt. XXVIII. 19, 20. That the Apostles were commanded to preach the gospel to every creature is not doubted, and it is equally certain that those they baptized were taught to observe the same thing, to the end of the world. "And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." 2 Tim. II. 2.

6th. The management at the beginning of their ministry, after the ascension of Christ, will cast some light on this subject. "And that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." "And all that believed were together and had all things common, and sold their possessions and parted them to all men, as every man had need." "Neither was there any among them that lacked: for as many as were possessors of lands or houses sold them, and brought the prices of the things that were sold, and laid

them down at the Apostles feet, and distribution was made unto every man according as he had need." Acts II. 44, 45. IV. 34, 35.

7th. This gospel kingdom, after continuing some years with the Jews, was translated to the Gentiles, and although the community of goods was not practised among them, yet benevolence was taught. And here a few quotations may suffice. "For brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this, thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." And as we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith." Gal. V. 13, 14. VI. 10. "Charge them that are rich in this world, that they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate." 1 Tim. VI. 17, 18. "But to do good and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." Heb. XIII. 16.

I have set down those undeniable facts, under the first head, that I may have them for references. I shall now review our author's essay, making that the second division, in my communication at this time. I would however remark, that some who oppose "the Tennessee Baptist Convention" are themselves effort baptists, but our author appears to be what he professes, anti effort. Let us hear him. "By what authority it is called, the Baptist Convention, I am at a loss to determine, as it was not authorised by the church." I will tell him in three particulars, by what authority it is so called. 1st. Notice of a meeting for that purpose was given in the publick papers, and sundry brethren met at Mill Creek, and the church was so far from forbidding it, that many of her members contributed to it. 2d. There are now several churches in it. *These have a mind to work.* 3rd. But the best Baptist church authority for it is in the New Testament. We will now attend to that, "Who was also chosen of the churches to travel with us with this grace, which is administered by us to the glory of the same Lord, and declaration of your ready mind: Avoiding this that no man should blame us in this abundance which is administered by us: Providing for honest things, not only in the sight of the Lord, but also in the sight of men. Whether any do inquire of Titus, he is my partner and fellowhelper concerning you: or our brethren be inquired of, they are the messengers of the churches, and the glory of Christ. Wherefore show ye them, and before the churches, the proof of your love and of our boasting on your behalf." 2 Cor. VIII. 19 to 24. There is not a man among the anti-effort baptists that can be called in the sense above stated, "the messenger of the churches and the glory of Christ." They are that much below par with primitive

churches. It is evident that those churches, did in some way convene for they moved in concert, and did collect funds, and their conduct is therefore sufficient authority for "a Baptist Convention." But it is objected that the churches associated their funds to supply the wants of poor saints, true. The ministers of the New Testament were effort, and of course were poor saints. The anti-effort ministers can go, one to his farm, and another to his merchandize, and become rich. For these there never was, no never ought to be, any provision made, for the New Testament does not know them. The following quotations will show, that ministers were included with poor saints. "For I mean not that other men be eased, and you burdened: but by an equality, that now at this time your abundance may be a supply for their want, that their abundance also may be a supply for your want, that there may be equality." 2 Cor. VIII. 13, 14. Here is reciprocity in the present tense. The abundance of spiritual things in the receivers, supplied the wants of the donors. Again, "Whiles by the experiment of this ministration they glorify God for your professed subjection unto the gospel of Christ, and for your liberal distribution unto them, and unto all men," 2 Cor. IX. 13. Beyond doubt "them and all men" took in the preachers. But why so afraid that the preachers draw rations out of this stock, when the Lord has "ordained that they which preach the gospel, shall live of the gospel." We have clear proof here, that the churches did associate in bringing funds together, to supply the calls of the day, and this furnishes a precedent for the same kind of association, or convention, to supply the calls of this day. But it is objected that there are individuals associated with these churches. Very well, Paul recognises them, but it ought always to be recollected that Paul was an effort man. At one time the brethren from Macedonia furnished a supply. 2 Cor. XI. 9. The house of Stephanas "addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints." 1 Cor. XVI. 15. Beside these we had anciently some brethren and sisters in the same work. Such as Phebe, Priscilla and Aquila, Mary and good Gaius. Rom. XVI, and 3d John. We once had some sisters at Phillippi with Clement. Phil. IV. 3. Beside there was one Onesiphorus an effort man, as you may see 2 Tim. I. 16, 17, 18. These were all effort, Baptists and were supposed to be a right good sort of people. 2d. "Its government over the ministry, which belongs neither to convention, association, nor church, - as it regards appointing their field of labour." This ought to be no objection. It is seen under the head of facts, that their field is the world. There is only one of two ways, in which the convention can send them out of their field of labour. One is to send them out of the world, the other is to send them where Levites once went. "And

he perceived that the portions of the Levites had not been given them: for the Levites and the singers that did the work, were fled every one to his field." Neh. XIII. 10. There can be no sort of difficulty here, for if their "hap" should be "to light" on a wrong part "of the field" there are anti-effort Baptists enough to shut their pulpits from them and set them right.

3rd. "Its products. It produces division, strife, and angry contentions. That the 'efforts' are doing this; needs no argument to prove." Astonishing that this should be the case. For forty years I have been "effort" but it has been mostly at my "own charges." For the length of time the ministry has been alike in my estate. But still I have something to spare, and this may continue during my life.

I have become very old and infirm, and as our preachers are mostly poor men, I have concluded to contribute something to their families, to supply their lack of service to them. Believing as I do that God would call no man to the ministry, who would be of more service to his family than he could be to the publick. Believing also that a minister will do more on seven days, than he can in two, and that the Lord does require his whole time in his service. Now as there are a number of brethren, and some churches like minded, we have united together in one common "effort" to free as many of our ministers as we can, from the care of their families, and by that means supply destitute places, which as far as we know, could not be otherwise supplied with baptist preaching. That such proceedings should produce "angry contentions" is unaccountable, when the convention does not expect, neither do they ask them for one cent of their money. What the convention does is at her own cost. These good brethren, when they are in good humour, pray for the very thing, the convention are striving to accomplish. I. e. that the gospel may "spread from sea to sea, and from the rivers to the ends of the earth." Could this be done, at the cost of ministers, it would produce no "angry contentions" in our opposing brethren. And I do hope the "angry contentions" will not be indulged in, any where else. "Mark them that cause divisions" &c. Our author is quite officious here. I wish he had quoted the whole text. I will do it for him. "Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions, and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them. For they that are such as serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." Rom. XVI. 17, 18. Mark well reader, for it is the doctrine which you have not learned from the scripture, that causes divisions, and as you have to mark myself, or my author, read both our treatises, and compare them with the word of 'od, and be not hasty in forming a judgment. It will assist you somewhat to have reference to our bellies. Being an effort man, I never devised any course to improve my estate, I have pinched my appetite rather than serve it, throughout a long ministry, and am willing still do it, in order to relieve others from the cares of the world, that they may preach the gospel. My author being an anti-effort is of another principle. This principle would allow him, (if he chose), to join a company of merchants, to "buy and sell, and get gain," and serve his appetite, until his cravings for wealth would be much gratified. Beside this doctrine in histreatise, is very acceptable to the anti-effort baptists, many of whom stand high in the scale of society. They will careen him for his doctrine, and this will be very gratifying to his appetite. Our author must have intended the half text, for the use of the anti-effort brethren. But from the description he gives of them, they are not in a situation to use it. Their "angry contentions," shows them to be but half awake, for men are apt to be peevish, when they are half asleep. To set men to marking, one of two animals, when they are in

that condition, is very improper, for they would as soon mark the wrong one, as the right one.

4th. "Its operations. By which these things are produced, seem to be these; you the people, give us the convention money, and we will give you the gospel, by sending missionaries." &c. I confess this is new to me, for the very design of conventional operations is, that the strong may help the weak, that the poor may have the gospel preached to them. It is true there are men, in all countries where the Bible is read, who believe that its precepts are to be regarded, one of which is, that they who preach the gospel shall live of the gospel. In obedience to the mandates of Heaven, those individuals hand in some money. The business of these missionaries is to preach the gospel. Had we however such missionaries were Paul and Titus, and the brethren chosen by the churches to travel with them, who would stir the churches to acts of benevolence, there would more money come in, but the principle of action would be the same. If Paul were here now, the anti-efforts would give him as much trouble as ever the Judaizing teachers did. Both set the plain command of God aside by their glosses. A little baby, and a little water is the result of Judaism. A little preaching and no money is the result of anti-effortism. Our author asks a question and gives the answer: "what preparation was made for their support?" "Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass, nor scrip." Matt. X. They return. The Saviour asked "what lacked ye," "they said nothing." This is the convention principle exactly: "Does the preacher of the convention do so too." Let us see. "He starts with a pledge from the convention, that he shall receive twenty dollars per month. Thus, he takes thought for what he shall eat, drink and wear." Had the last clause in the above quotation, been reversed, it would have been the truth. It seems our author would have the ministers take no thought for their support, neither shall the convention take thought for them, neither shall the church. They are to live it seems on an unrealized promise of God. For I have understood him that the church, nor no body else is under any obligation to God, to support his ministers. I may however, have misunderstood him, for I perceive his talent lies in making plain things dark. They have no alternative, but the promise of God which cannot correctly be realized. Let us hear the Lord on that subject "Ye are cursed with a curse; for ye have robbed me, even this whole nation." Mal. III. 9. It is true the Lord could have, (had it been his pleasure) commanded the ravens to supply the wants of his ministers, and they would have done it with pleasure, for they have done the like in time past. Our author makes a great handle of the "ten dollar membership." He may make himself easy on that subject, for many of the effort brethren, object to that. Those in favour of it, are not rigid. Indeed, I never did business with a set of more pious men. Our author delivers a long harangue on Paul asking forgiveness of the church at Corinth. See 2 Cor. XI. 7, 8. XII. 13. It seems his wrong lay not in preaching the gospel to them without charge, but in his having robbed other churches, taking wages of them, to enable him to preach the gospel at Corinth freely. Now it seems his crime did not lie in preaching the gospel freely at Corinth, but rather in the robbery committed on other churches. In reply I would remark that Paul was a man of sense, and had it been wrong for him to receive wages from some churches, to enable him to render service to another, he would have asked forgiveness of the churches, from whom the wages was received, for they were the only ones injured, if indeed any were. Beside he received wages from the church at Philippi, to serve the church at Thessalonica. They sent twice to him while there, and once while in his hired house at Rome. And what is very extraordinary is, that all this was "well pleasing to God." Phil. IV.

14, to 18. But our author thinks himself quite secure in his position, for he thinks Paul would not have asked forgiveness for a wrong, and yet persist in it. Paul had to choose among evils, and take the least. It was better to persist in the wrong, when a person was injured by it, than to have contended for what was right, when if he had received it, his adversaries there would have reproached him, and by that means the gospel, then in its infancy, at that place, would have been hindered. But what is intended by this far-fetched view of the case. I will tell you. By it our author wishes to show, that the convention is wrong, to receive contributions from churches in one part of the country, to render services in another.

The convention takes Paul in some measure for their example. They want nothing from the churches, least they should hinder the gospel among them. There are two sorts of people, who will preach the gospel freely, the one is able to support it and will not, the other is willing to support it and cannot.

Our author tells us that the gospel was preached in all the world, by the apostles, and that too without money. If they did so, they did it in about forty years, and this is more than our anti-effort brethren would have done in forty thousand years. But he intimates they will yet do it, not by the use of money but by persecution. It is a fact that the church of Christ have been persecuted less or more from the apostolic age until this day, and instead of gaining the ground she has lost much of it. But by what means soever the gospel may be preached to every creature whether by the aid of money or persecution, they will be effort who do it.

Take the aggregate of time, means and persons employed, and it brings out about five years effort, of the whole denomination of Baptists throughout the world. In which time they have preached the gospel to about one eighth of the heathen world. According to this rule of calculating (which is not pretended to be entirely accurate) forty years effort of the whole denomination, would evangelize the whole world.

I now close with the following remarks.

1st. When the Lord gave the command, that the gospel should be preached to every creature, it was his will that his command should be obeyed.

2nd. The Lord has not called this command in. It is therefore in as much force as when he gave it.

3rd. In giving this command, the Lord had all his appointments in view, in order to the performance.

4th. The reason why the apostles complied with this commandment as far as they did, was, there was nothing lacking in God's arrangement, that was not furnished.

5th. The reason this command is not now complied with is, because the spirit, and means which was then furnished, is now lacking.

6th. The Baptist church will not be "pure from the blood of all men" in that sense in which Paul was, until this command is complied with.

7th. If the Lord has commanded to preach the gospel to every creature abroad, he has also commanded to preach it to every creature at home.

#### NOTICE.

Brethren and Agents who send us the names of subscribers or make remittances, are requested to mention particularly the name of the Post Office at which the person resides to whom they wish The Baptist sent or the credit given; and when they request an alteration of direction from one Post Office to another, it is necessary that they give us the name of the office at which the subscriber now receives his paper, as well as that at which he wishes to receive it in future.